**REMARKS** 

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and

reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the

amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. §

1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the

merits.

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the

claims of the application. Claims 1, 3-19, 21-25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, and 36 are presently

pending. Claims 1, 3, 10-13, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, and 33 are amended herein. Claims 2,

26, and 31 are withdrawn or cancelled herein. No new claims are added herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] Examiners Hasan and Tran graciously met with me—the undersigned

representative for the Applicant—on July 9, 2008 at the USPTO. Applicant greatly

appreciates the Examiners' willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of

us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application. During the

interview, we discussed removal of the Mukerjee reference via 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as subject

to assignment to the same assignee.

[0005] Applicant's representative thanked the Examiners for allowing independent

claim 17. Also, I understood the Examiners to tentatively agree that independent claims 1,

25, and 30 would be patentable over the remaining references if amended to incorporate

subject matter from dependent claims 2, 26, and 31.

Serial No.: 10/686,969

Atty Docket No.: MS1-1683US

Atty/Agent: Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas

lee&hayes The Business of IP™

[0006] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the

interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the

cited references of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than [0007]

allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner.

I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—

so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and

efficiently over the phone. Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone

interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I

welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this

response.

Allowable Subject Matter

[80001 Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 17-19 and

21-24. These claims have not been amended herein, and therefore remain allowable.

**Claim Amendments** 

[0009] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of

interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 10-13, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32,

and 33 herein. Applicant amends these claims to highlight claimed features. Such

amendments are made to expedite prosecution and to more quickly identify allowable

subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to highlight the claimed features,

Serial No.: 10/686,969

Atty Docket No.: MS1-1683US

Atty/Agent: Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas

lee Whaves The Business of IP™

and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the

cited references.

CITED ART SUBJECT TO OBLIGATION OF ASSIGNMENT TO SAME

ASSIGNEE – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (C)

**[0010]** The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove Mukerjee et

al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0013365 as a prior art reference in

prosecution of the instant application as a result of the following statement as set forth in

the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, 706.02(1)(2) II.

[0011] The instant application and the cited reference, U.S. Patent Application

Publication 2005/0013365, were, at the time the invention of the instant application was

made, both subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corporation. Applicant

respectfully submits that the cited art, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0013365,

only qualifies as prior art under § 102(e), and shared a common assignee with the instant

application at the time the subject matter of the instant application was conceived. Thus,

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0013365, which was cited in combination with

Itokawa, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033620 and Robotham et al., U.S.

Patent No. 5,627,765 under § 103(a) should be disqualified under § 103(c).

Serial No.: 10/686,969

Atty Docket No.: MS1-1683US

Atty/Agent: Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas

lee@hayes The Business of IP 12

**Substantive Matters** 

Claim Rejections under § 102 and § 103

[0012] Claims 1-16, 25-28, 30-33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or §

103. In light of the amendments presented herein, removal of the Mukerjee reference,

and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview,

Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the

Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Independent Claims 1, 25, and 30

[0013] Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 25, and 30 are patentable over

the Itokawa and Robotham at least for the reason that each has been amended to incorporate

subject matter from dependent claims for which the rejection relied upon a removed

reference. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each of these

claims.

Dependent Claims 3-16, 27, 28, 32, 33, and 36

**[0014]** Each of these claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 25, and 30.

and 30. As discussed above, claims 1, 25, and 30 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any

dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable.

Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional

Serial No.: 10/686,969

Atty Docket No.: MS1-1683US

Atty/Agent: Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas

lee@hayes The Business of IP10

-16-

independent reasons. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

## **Conclusion**

[0015] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before** issuing a subsequent Action. Please call or email me at your convenience.

-17-

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Representatives for Applicant

Dated: 7/24/7008

Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas (bea@leehayes.com; x259)

Registration No. 58,213

Kayla Brant (kayla@leehayes.com; x242)

Registration No. 46,576

Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com

Serial No.: 10/686,969

Atty Docket No.: MS1-1683US

Atty/Agent: Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas

lee&hayes The Business of IP \*\*\*

www.leehayes.com 503 324.9256